

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this document is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, addressed to IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D. C. 20231 on this 16th day of August 1999

Dated

GAU 1772

15 Applicant:

Stephen G. Nelson

Ex. N. Ahmad

Serial No.:

09/037,315

A/U 1772

20 Filing Date:

March 9, 1998

Title: Method For Manufacturing

One-Way See-Through Films)

25

5

10

RESPONSE

Box No Fee AMENDMENT **Assistant Commissioner for Patents** Washington, D. C. 20231

30

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action dated July 15, 1999. The Examiner has required restriction under 35 U.S.C. §121.

PROVISIONAL ELECTION AND TRAVERSE

35 The Applicant provisionally elects Group II, Claims 8 to 10 drawn to a one-way see-through panel.

Applicant traverses the requirement as the process claimed cannot be utilized to

make a materially different product. The product is a see-through, one-way panel having an opaque polymeric substrate with a dark pigmented adhesive on the rear side. The adhesive is coated with a release liner so that the panel may be applied to a surface once the liner is removed or peeled off. The substrate, adhesives and liner are perforated and an imperforate barrier is laminated over the liner to prevent spray through during printing. The front surface is printed with a graphic image by using specialized printing technology such as an ink jet. The front is first treated with a top coating so it will accept the ink as these inks are not directly compatible with substrates such as polymeric materials.

The Examiner states that the process could be used to produce a panel having an opaque light colored substrate instead of an opaque light-reflecting substrate. Such panels would be substantially the same since the terms "light colored" and "light reflecting" both describe materials having non-light absorbing characteristics.

The top coating on which the printing, graphics or images are to be applied to render them receptive to the ink is applied only to the front or image bearing surface.

Thus, applying the top coating to the second or rear surface would be a different product which would not be image receptive.

Applicant requests the restriction requirement be withdrawn and that the claims of both groups be examined.

A favorable action is solicited.

5

10

15

August 15, 1999

5

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory J. Nelson, Reg. No. 22,066
Nelson & Roediger
Attorneys for Applicant
2623 North Seventh Street
Phoenix Asiana 25006

Phoenix, Arizona 85006

(602) 263-8782